

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
VALDOSTA DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

v.

JASON C. JOHNSON,

Defendant.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

CASE NO: 7:23-CR-74 (WLS)

ORDER

Before the Court is an Unopposed Motion to Continue Trial in the Interest of Justice (Doc. 31), (“Motion to Continue”) filed by the Defendant on March 14, 2024. Therein, Defendant requests the Court to continue the trial of this matter from the Valdosta Division May 2024 trial term to the next Valdosta term. Defense Counsel states the continuance is necessary for him to receive the subpoenaed records authorized by the Court, to review those documents, and discuss them with the Defendant. Defense Counsel represents that the Government does not oppose the continuance. Defendant, through counsel, further states that the above circumstances warrant finding excludable delay under the provisions of the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161, *et seq.*, and that the ends of justice served by the granting the continuance “outweigh the best interests of the public and the United States Attorney’s Office in a speedy trial.”¹

Based on the Defendant’s stated reasons, the Court finds that the ends of justice served by granting a continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the Defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A)-(B). Therefore, the Motion (Doc. 31) is **GRANTED**.

The Court hereby **ORDERS** that the trial in the above-referenced matter be **CONTINUED** to the Valdosta Division August 2024 trial term and its conclusion, or as may otherwise be ordered by the Court. Furthermore, it is **ORDERED** that the time lost under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161, is **EXCLUDED** pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)

¹ To satisfy 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A)-(B), the Court assumes Defense Counsel intended to state that the ends of justice served by granting the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the *Defendant* in a speedy trial, and the Court so finds based on the statements in the Motion.

because the Court has continued the trial in this case and finds that the failure to grant a continuance (a) would likely result in a miscarriage of justice, and (b) would deny Defense Counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i), (iv).

SO ORDERED, this 15th day of March 2024.

/s/ W. Louis Sands

**W. LOUIS SANDS, SR. JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**